



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*English Colonies in America.* Volume IV. *The Middle Colonies.*

Volume V. *The Colonies Under the House of Hanover.* By J. A. DOYLE, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1907. Pp. xvi, 447; xvi, 497.)

THE earlier volumes of Mr. Doyle's history have long been familiar to scholars and their merits and demerits have been so adequately presented and discussed that no comment on the work as a whole is necessary here. After the publication of volumes two and three so long a time elapsed that scholars abandoned the hope of seeing the completed work and the history promised to remain but a fragment. Yet despite advancing years—Mr. Doyle was sixty-three at the time of his death in August last—despite distractions in the way of farming, dog-breeding, rifle-shooting and interest in politics, education and sport, and despite residence in southern Wales, away from London and other library centres, Mr. Doyle succeeded in finishing his task, a noteworthy accomplishment in the face of advancing ill-health.

During the forty years that have elapsed since Mr. Doyle first turned his attention to American history, and particularly, during the twenty-one years since the second and third volumes were published, the study of our colonial period has made rapid strides in the direction of sounder scholarship, wider range of material employed and more thorough appreciation of the problems involved. Neglected periods and neglected subjects have received attention, and points of view, once parochial, are becoming imperial; in a word, colonial history has shared the general advance of scientific historical study in America. How far Mr. Doyle has co-operated in this movement and how far these volumes, issued after a lapse of nearly a quarter of a century, are representative of the historical standards of the present day are naturally our first concern when we approach this work for purposes of review.

From Mr. Doyle, as an Englishman, we have a right to expect at least two important contributions to our subject: first, a full and accurate description of the British organs of government, legislation and administration so far as the colonies were concerned, together with an account of the system and incidents of British colonial control; secondly, a thorough and scholarly use of the material in British record repositories, and a consequent addition of new information and new ideas. In view of this expectation, it will surprise the reader to learn that Mr. Doyle has failed to take adequate advantage of the opportunity which residence in England furnished; in nearly all respects his work might better have been written in America than in England; his point of view is persistently provincial; his account of the British system and management is limited to a few scattered paragraphs; and his

material is drawn chiefly from printed books, not always the best or the most recent. As might have been anticipated by students familiar with those libraries, the Bodleian and the British Museum frequently failed to furnish Mr. Doyle with books that would have been readily accessible in America; and although he has made a limited use of the Colonial Office papers in the Record Office, he shows no familiarity with other manuscript material, and his only reference to the Privy Council Register is to a quotation in Palfrey's *History of New England*. Of the *Calendars of State Papers* he has used only those relating to America and the West Indies, and these sparingly and without discrimination. Of the *Calendars of Domestic and Treasury Papers* he apparently knows nothing.

Mr. Doyle's treatment of the problem of British control is open to more serious criticism. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that his volumes should have made their appearance in the same year with Professor Osgood's third volume, which marks the highest point reached thus far in the scientific interpretation of colonial history. Professor Osgood deals with the acts of trade, the councils and committees of trade and plantations and the British management of the royal colonies as an integral and component part of an entire volume. Mr. Doyle pushes them aside as only incidental, massing the greater part of what he has to say in a chapter entitled Administrative Development, a *potpourri* of all sorts of things "administrative", whether local, central, or imperial. The portions of that chapter dealing with the acts of trade are so confusing and incorrect as to be almost unintelligible. The act of 1650 is omitted entirely; the list of enumerated commodities mentioned in the act of 1660 is wrongly given; the account of the act of 1663 says nothing of imported commodities from the Continent, the most important feature of the act; no mention is made of the act of 1672, and, as far as one can tell, Mr. Doyle seems to think that the "plantation duty" was imposed by the act of 1696. In any case, the three lines and a half devoted to that act are otherwise meaningless. Even the Molasses Act is not given correctly. That Mr. Doyle has very little knowledge of the British official establishment in America is shown by his remarks about the few officials whom he mentions and by his failure to discuss in any adequate way the subjects of customs, vice-admiralty, woods and the organization of the royal provinces in general.

It is evident, therefore, that when tested by modern standards Mr. Doyle's work falls far short of the ideal. Volume IV. contains histories of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania from earliest times to 1714, a date selected because it marks the succession of the House of Hanover. Volume V. contains a history of Georgia from 1732 to 1752, an account of the conquest of Canada to 1759, which, curiously enough, refers only incidentally to the fall of Quebec, and a series of chapters containing information on all sorts of subjects, gathered dur-

ing a wide reading of printed sources and arranged under headings that are more or less appropriate. General Conditions of the Colonies, Administrative Development, Economical Progress, are fairly comprehensive terms, and Mr. Doyle has used them to cover everything that he could not put elsewhere, furnishing, as he says, "a convenient, though not a scientific, arrangement of facts". He defends these chapters by saying that "in the eighteenth century the main interest is not internal but external", a statement with which all will not agree. In fact, the leading interest from 1714 to 1755 is internal and not external, and the limitation or exclusion of the powers and functions of the legislative and executive bodies, the adjustment whether by conflict or compromise of the relations between the various members of the bodies politic, and the growth in wealth and experience of the men who were to share in the later conflicts are the leading features of colonial history in the first half of the eighteenth century. These "internal" aspects of his subject Mr. Doyle has, in large part, ignored, and in so doing has but followed the other writers who saw nothing in the middle period of colonial history other than wars and religious revivals.

The narrative histories are good and in some parts excellent. The account of Leisler's rebellion is admirable, and the chapter on Georgia, while diffuse, is well worth reading. Less praise can be given to the chapters on New Jersey and Pennsylvania, which are made unnecessarily uninteresting, particularly in the later portions, while the chapter on the conquest of Canada shows, even more than do the histories of the individual colonies, how much Mr. Doyle has missed in failing to use the great mass of letters, despatches and other documents in the Public Record Office, some of which have recently been printed in the *Pitt Correspondence*. In style, Mr. Doyle has improved upon his earlier work, and his treatment is more direct and less confused. His comments on persons and situations are frequent, and, though somewhat dogmatic in tone and occasionally based on insufficient knowledge of his subject, are thoughtful, judicious and in most cases fair. All that he has to say about Nicolls, Dongan, Hunter, Penn, Shirley, Hutchinson and Oglethorpe is open to little modification. His comments on Andros incline to severity but are not conspicuously unjust. He overstates Bellomont's weaknesses as a party leader and underrates his influence as an administrator and the difficulties of the situation in New York. In judging Nicholson, he seems to leave out of account that governor's later career; and few will agree with him in charging John Winthrop with "a characteristic incapacity to see the real point at issue", with "characteristic compliance", or with "characteristic readiness to substitute his own opinion for the authoritative voice of the colony". He deems the conquest of New Netherland "an unrighteous outrage", as it was, but he is unjust, with an unjustness born of ignorance, when he rebukes Berkeley and Carteret for their "unscrupulous greed" in obtaining New Jersey. To Berkeley, it was but a fair recompense for

the £3500 which he lost in purchasing the Earl of Stirling's rights in Long Island; to Carteret it was but a poor return for his services to Charles I., Charles II. and the Duke of York, for as early as 1649 Charles II. had promised in most affectionate terms to compensate Carteret for his devotion to the late king, and the Duke of York owed something to the man who in 1650 turned his own family out of his castle in Jersey to make room for the duke and his retainers. Mr. Doyle would have spoken more respectfully of Conrad Weiser had he ever read Mr. Walton's life of that interesting personage, and he would probably have been less severe in his comments on the Quakers in Pennsylvania had he consulted Sharpless's *Apologia* for Quaker government or approached the subject from other than the military side. His opinion of North Carolina as the seat of a "dull unreceptive barbarism" and his constant slurs on the people of that colony will not be approved by North Carolinian historians.

Toward the colonies as a whole his tone is sympathetic, indeed almost too much so, for Mr. Doyle has little patience with British stupidity, incapacity and ignorance (*cf.* V. 217, 418, 449).

It is unfortunate that Mr. Doyle's volumes are marred by a large number of errors of fact, misspellings of personal and place names, and offenses against consistency and good form in the make-up of his foot-notes. An enumeration of these blemishes, nearly all of which might have been removed had the proof passed through the hands of a competent American scholar, would occupy too much space and cannot be attempted here. That they are due to carelessness and ignorance and not to faulty proof-reading is evident from the presence in the volumes of but few typographical errors ("essential", "sumbit", IV. 80, 143; "entitled", and "2875" for 275, V. 43 n., 104 n.). It is hard to understand why an Englishman cannot write Guilford instead of "Guildford", New Haven instead of "Newhaven", New Hampshire instead of "New Hants", but it is harder to see why a scholar should spell Eliot "Elliot", Johnson "Johnstone", Loudoun "Loudon", Phips "Phipps", etc., should locate towns, bridges, ferries and fords where they never existed, should misquote passages taken from original texts, should give wrongly author's names and works (Stainer, Crosse, "Bury" for Barry, Mr. Elking's monograph, *The Dutch Village*, etc.), and should refer to the same volumes or series of volumes in half a dozen different ways. Even more irritating are references to "Pennsylvania Records" and to "Laws of Pennsylvania" without series, volume or page, to "The Colonial Records" without section, volume or bundle, or to such a title as "Colonial Papers, Pennsylvania, 559", a form that I cannot identify; it may be *America and West Indies*, 599, Pennsylvania. References to the printed *Calendar* are often equally obscure, and such sources as "Callaghan", "Mass. Hist. Collection", "Political Quarterly" are to be met with. But we cannot pursue this phase of the subject further. The student

familiar with the literature and sources of colonial history will generally recognize the works to which Mr. Doyle refers and will probably have little difficulty in looking up his references if he care to do so.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Our Struggle for the Fourteenth Colony. Canada and the American Revolution.* In two volumes. By JUSTIN H. SMITH, Professor of Modern History in Dartmouth College. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1907. Pp. xv, 638; xvii, 635.)

RARELY has an author taken more pains to know thoroughly the subject he writes about, than has Professor Smith in his study of the attempt during the Revolutionary War to secure Canada as a member of the American union. Not content with ransacking every known collection of printed material on the subject—government documents, pamphlets, newspapers, biographical matter of every kind—the author has visited the archives here and abroad and has made a tireless examination of every source available. Moreover, he has visited the scenes of the historical events and as a result tells his story with a vividness which adds greatly to the clearness with which we see the historical events. As a result of the great care taken in investigation, we have in these two volumes a definitive account of the subject, amply fortified with references, and with critical notes at the end of each volume. It is a cause for real regret that the author's strivings for literary effects of the tinsel variety have seriously vitiated his work.

So serious are the literary defects of the book that the reviewer cannot honestly pass them by; though he has such real admiration for Professor Smith's zeal and thoroughness in research that he would gladly ignore the errors in taste. To understand this stricture we must have before us some of the examples. A falls (I. 541) becomes under Professor Smith's fine-writing pen "the Ultima Thule of the salmon". A babe, whom the soldiers pass in the forest (I. 540), is "a wee, soft bud on the top shoot of civilization". The men do not prosaically fish, but "many a line dropped its barbed invitation into the water". Nor was this mere vulgar water, but "glowed with a pale, golden-blue flush, brightened with quickly vanishing stars where countless invisible wings dipped into invisible dust, and radiant here and there with dimples and smiles" (I. 555). Many such descriptions are thrown in *gratis*, and not because the historical narrative is made more vivid thereby. The soldiers, for example, do not camp in a humdrum place, but where (I. 560) "a pair of great pines towered above some fluttering birches like the cathedral spires above Chartres with a fine young elm keeping guard in front of them all, a soft maple, full of low, rich tones, bending from the point like a Sicilian girl at the fountain".